STATE OF MONTANA 1 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS 2 IN THE MATTER OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE NO. 21-93 3 GLENDIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, MEA/NEA, 4 5 Complainant, FINDINGS OF FACT; CONCLUSIONS OF LAW: 6 M55 + 1 ORDER GLENDIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 7 DISTRICT NO. ONE: TRUSTEES AND SUPERINTENDENT, DAN MARTIN, 8 Defendant. 9 10

I. INTRODUCTION

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

175

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

284

On October 15, 1992, the Glendive Education Association filed this charge with the Board alleging the Glendive Elementary School District No. 1, Trustees and Superintendent Dan Martin had violated Sections 39-31-201, 39-31-203, 39-31-401(1),(2) and (5), MCA. At pre-hearing conducted in this matter on January 14, 1993, the Parties agreed to submission of the issues involved in the above-cited charges through Brief submission. Final Brief was received February 24, 1993.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Defendant had employed Debbie Olson-Sevier during school year 1991-92 as an adaptive physical education teacher. Ms. Olson-Sevier was to provide adaptive physical education services to certain of Defendant district students. For the 1992-93 school year Ms. Olson-Sevier performed the same services but, according to the Defendant, as an independent contractor. The Defendant refused to recognize Ms. Olson-Sevier as a bargaining unit member. On September 21, 1992, Ms. Olson-Sevier submitted written

- authorization to the defendant clerk of schools to deduct union dues in the amount certified by the complainant's secretary. On September 21, 1992, Defendant's clerk refused to deduct or transmit the certified dues amount to the complainant. The Complainant contends such refusal constitutes a violation of Montana Labor Law under Sections 39-31-201, 39-31-203, 39-31-401(1),(2) and (5), MCA.
- 2. The Defendant negotiated independently an independent contract with Ms. Olson-Sevier contending she was an independent contractor. Ms. Olson-Sevier's duties and responsibilities did not change during either of the school terms. The complainant is recognized as the exclusive bargaining representative for all employees in the Glendive Education Association. The complainant moved for summary judgement on the pleadings based upon the position that no material fact existed and the charges are capable of determination based upon Briefs.

16 III. ISSUES

. 9

- 1. Was or is Ms. Olson-Sevier an independent contractor in her association with the defendant?
- 2. If not an independent contractor did the Defendant violate Montana Labor Laws as identified.

21 IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- The Board of Personnel Appeals has jurisdiction over this matter.
- 2. Ms. Olson-Sevier was not an independent contractor. As correctly pointed out in the Complainant's Brief, an independent contractor association exists only when the contractor is free from control and direction by the employer and the contractor is

independently established in a business with work similar to that performed for the employer.

- Ms. Olson-Sevier was subject to control and direction and not independently established in a business.
- 4. The Defendant does not deny the Complainant is the exclusive bargaining agent for certain school employees as defined in the collective bargaining agreement. Ms. Olson-Sevier is included in the group of persons described as in the unit covered by the collective bargaining agreement. Under the express terms of the collective bargaining agreement and Montana Labor Law the Defendant must not individually bargain with unit members and must also respond to unit member's requests to have dues appropriately transferred to the Complainant association.

V. ORDER

3.3

1.5

1.6

The Motion for summary judgment on the pleadings is appropriate. The Defendant is found to have violated Section 39-31-305(1), 39-31-201, 203, and 401(1), (2) and (5). The Defendant must bargain as required in the collective bargaining agreement with the complainant association regarding the employment of Ms. Olson-Sevier.

Entered and dated this 26 day of May, 1993.

Joseph V. Maronick Hearing Examiner

Hearing Examiner

OTICE: Under application of Board Rule ARM 24.25

NOTICE: Under application of Board Rule ARM 24.25.107(2), the above RECOMMENDED ORDER shall become the FINAL ORDER of this Board unless written exceptions are filed within twenty (20) day after service of these FINDINGS OF FACT; CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; AND RECOMMENDED ORDER upon the parties.

* * * * * * * * *